



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

# Chandigarh Administration Gazette

Published by Authority

NO. 115]

CHANDIGARH, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2022 ( BHADRA 23, 1944 SAKA)

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION  
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

## Notification

The 30th August, 2022

**No. 13/1/9372-HII(2)-2022/12763.**—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR (PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. 25/2017 dated 29.07.2022 delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

PRESIDENT / GENERAL SECRETARY, PUNJAB ROADWAYS WORKERS' UNION,  
JEEWANDEEP BUILDING, SECTOR 17, CHANDIGARH (Workers' Union)

AND

1. THE DIRECTOR STATE TRANSPORT PUNJAB, JEEWANDEEP BUILDING, SECTOR 17, CHANDIGARH.
2. THE GENERAL MANAGER, PUNJAB ROADWAYS, JEEWANDEEP BUILDING, SECTOR 17, CHANDIGARH (Management)

referred to the said court by the Chandigarh Administration bearing Endorsement No. 13/1/9372-HII(2)-2017 9778, dated 11.05.2017.

## AWARD

1. On 02.08.2017 the following reference for adjudication was received from the Worthy Secretary Labour, Chandigarh Administration bearing No.13/1/9372-HII(2)-2017/9778 dated 11.05.2017 under Section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (*hereinafter referred in short 'ID Act'*), accompanied with copy of demand notice dated 11.06.2015 under Section 2(k) of the ID Act :—

*"Whether the demand raised in the demand notice dated 06.11.2013 (sic) by President / General Secretary, Punjab Roadways Workers Union, Jeewandeep Building, Sector 17, Chandigarh And (i) The Director State Transport Punjab, Jeewandeep Building, Sector 17, Chandigarh (2) The General Manager, Punjab Roadways, Jeewandeep Building, Sector 17, Chandigarh, are genuine and justified. If so, to what effect and to what relief the Union/Workers are entitled to, if any ?"*

(903)

*This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :*

<https://egazette.chd.gov.in>

Signature Not Verified  
Digitally Signed by  
Jatinder Kumar  
Date: 14-09-2022  
15:51:19 IST  
Reason: Published  
Location:

2. On notice Shri Amrit Pal Singh - Law Officer appeared on behalf of management No. 1 & 2 on 13.09.2017. On 10.10.2017 representative for the workers' union made a statement that demand notice dated 11.06.2015 may be treated as statement of claim. Accordingly, vide order dated 10.10.2017 demand notice dated 11.06.2015 was ordered to be treated as statement of claim.

3. In the demand notice the workman has alleged that on 11.06.2015, general meeting of Punjab Roadways Workers' Union (I.N.T.U.C.) (Regd.), Chandigarh was held and it was unanimously resolved that in justice has been done with Jasbir Singh - Driver No.77 (Punjab Roadways, Chandigarh by denying the benefits of medical leave on account of injuries suffered by the Driver in an accident occurred during the course of duty, by an order dated 22.03.2011 / 24.03.2011 and appeal filed by Driver was also rejected by order dated 07.07.2011. Therefore, the union has decided to file the demand notice for justice on his behalf. The union has further decided to authorise, Secretary and President of the union to sign the necessary pleadings on behalf of the union and to appoint authorised representative to represent the case on behalf of union before Assistant Labour Commissioner, Chandigarh as well as before the Labour Court, U.T. Chandigarh. It is further stated that the workman was on duty on 28.10.2010. During course of his duty his bus met with an accident and the workman suffered bodily injuries including fracture of legs. The workman remained in hospital for 4-5 days due to injuries. The workman could not join his duties with effect from 28.02.2010 to 28.02.2011 due to medical ground. The workman was declared fit to join his duties on 01.03.2011, therefore, the workman joined on 02.03.2011. The workman had been applying leave on medical grounds as per order dated 22.03.2011 / 24.03.2011, whereby the General Manager has not considered his leave as special medical leave rather treated the leave with effect from 29.10.2010 to 12.12.2010 as leave with full pay, from 13.12.2010 to 21.01.2011 as earned leave for 80 days and half pay leave for 40 days and from 21.01.2011 to 01.03.2011 without pay, which action is illegal and against the law. The workman filed an appeal and the same was dismissed on 07.07.2011. The above action on the part of the management is illegal because the workman had suffered injury during the course of his employment, therefore the workman was entitled for special medical leave as per the provisions of Rule 8.124 and Rule 8.125 of Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume - I, Part - I, according to which employee is entitled to 24 months special leave with full salary. Secretary Transport, Punjab also issued instructions dated 10.02.1997 under which it is specifically provided that if the Driver of the Punjab Roadways get injuries during the course of employment then he shall be entitled to leave with pay for the period he remained under treatment due to injuries. The order dated 22.03.2011 / 24.03.2011 and order dated 07.07.2011 are illegal and void and in violation of principle of natural justice because no hearing was given before passing the order. The workman made several requests to withdraw the illegal orders dated 23.03.2011 / 24.03.2011 and 07.07.2011 but all in vain. Hence, the demand notice. Prayer is made that illegal orders dated 23.03.2011 / 24.03.2011 and 07.07.2011 may be withdrawn and benefits illegally denied may be released to the workman along with interest @12% per annum within a period of fifteen days before the receipt of this demand notice.

4. The management No. 1 & 2 contested the demand notice-cum-statement of claim by filing joint written reply dated 28.03.2018 wherein preliminary objections are raised on the ground that the demand notice is not maintainable in the present form. The workman raised the industrial dispute and challenged the orders in question after delay and latches and deserves dismissal. The workman has no *locus standi* because no legal right of workman has been infringed. No cause of action accrues to the workman for filing the demand notice. The workman has not approached this Court with clean hands and suppressed the true and correct facts that the department has legally passed the order in question. The version of the workman was considered by the managements but found not satisfactory and not supporting to the version of workman. Orders in question were passed under the provisions of the Punjab Civil Services Rules. At the time of accident of the workman, the department granted the leave as per the provisions of Punjab Civil Services Rules. The department had been granting the medical leave to the workman as per rules whereas workman was not entitled for the hospital

leave. As per order dated 24.03.2011 during the period of treatment the workman had only 45 days earned leave and 80 days medical leave in his leave account. The department granted 45 days earned leave and 40 days against the commuted medical leave of 80 days. The department had granted 39 days extra ordinary leave without pay as the workman had no more leave in his leave account. The workman had filed the appeal to the Secretary State Transport, Punjab against the order dated 24.03.2011 passed by the management No. 2 which is pending for adjudication but the workman had concealed the facts in his demand notice. Thus, the demand notice is liable to be dismissed.

5. Further on merits, it is denied as wrong that general meeting of the Punjab Roadways Workers' Union Chandigarh was held on 11.06.2015 wherein it was unanimously resolved to file demand notice on behalf of Jasbir Singh - Driver No. 77, Punjab Roadways for denying the benefits of medical leave. It is stated that the worker's union has not placed on record the proceedings of the meeting held on 11.06.2015. It is denied as wrong that the department illegally denied the benefits of medical leave. As per order dated 24.03.2011 during the period of treatment the workman had only 45 days earned leave and 80 days medical leave in his account. The department granted 45 days earned leave and 40 days against the commuted medical leave of 80 days. The department had granted 39 days extra ordinary leave, without pay as the workman had no more leave in his account. Therefore, the department has rightly passed the orders in question as per law. It is admitted to the extent that the workman was injured while his bus met with an accident. It is a matter of record that the workman remained in hospital for 4-5 days and could not join his duties with effect from 28.10.2010 to 28.02.2011 due to medical grounds and that the workman was declared fit to join his duties on 01.03.2011. It is stated that the workman may be put to strict proof of the same. It is admitted to the extent that the workman had applied leave on medical basis. The management No. 2 has passed order in question as per Punjab Civil Services Rules. The action of management No. 1 & 2 is legal and as per law while passing the order in question. Leave case of the workman could not be covered under Rule 8.124 and 8.125 of Punjab Civil Services Rules. The provisions of Rule 8.124 is only applicable to the employees, who have been disabled in consequence of service with the military force. Rest of the contents of the demand notice are denied as wrong. Prayer is made that the demand notice may be dismissed.

6. Replication not filed. From the pleadings of the parties following issues were framed *vide* order dated 25.04.2018 :—

1. Whether the demand raised in the demand notice dated 11.06.2015 by the workers' union is genuine & justified, if so, to what effect and to what relief the workers' union / workman are entitled to, if any ? OPW
2. Relief.

7. In evidence the workman Jasbir Singh examined himself as AW1 and tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' along with documents copy of appeal dated 09.02.2012 filed by Jasbir Singh to Secretary Transport, State of Punjab, Chandigarh against order dated 22.12.2011 - 03.01.2012 passed by the Director State Transport, Punjab, Chandigarh *vide* Exhibit 'W1'; copy of order dated 22.03.2011 passed by the General Manager, Punjab Roadways Chandigarh *vide* Mark 'A'. Copy of letter No.12855 dated 07.11.2011 on the subject of comments on appeal filed by Jasbir Singh Driver No.77, Punjab Roadways, Chandigarh *vide* Mark 'B'; copy of instructions issued by Secretary Transport, Punjab bearing No.17/54 dated 10.02.1997 *vide* Mark 'C'; photocopy of judgment dated 01.05.2015, passed by the Court of Shri Anubhav Sharma, ACJ(SD), Chandigarh in Case Code No.201700288612013, Civil Suit No.146/2013 is suit for declaration and mandatory injunction titled as Sukhdev Singh Versus State of Punjab & Others *vide* Mark 'D'. The workman examined AW2 Indu Shekhar, Establishment Clerk, office of General Manager, Punjab Roadways Chandigarh. On 18.11.2019 the learned representative for the workers' union closed the evidence on behalf of the workers' union.

8. Managements examined MW1 Surinder Singh - Clerk, office of General Manager, Punjab Roadways, Chandigarh who tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' along with documents i.e. authority letter dated 30.01.2020 issued in his favour by Karanjit Singh, General Manager, Punjab Roadways, Chandigarh authorising him to give defence evidence by way of affidavit in this case on behalf of the management No.1 & 2 *vide* Exhibit 'M1'. The management examined MW2 Amit Kumar - Clerk, office of General Manager, Punjab Roadways, Chandigarh who tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'MW2/A' along with authority letter dated 20.07.2021 issued in his favour by Karanjit Singh, General Manager, Punjab Roadways, Chandigarh authorising him to give defence evidence in this case on behalf of the management *vide* Exhibit 'M2'; attested copy of letter dated 19.04.2011 issued by Jasbir Singh - Driver No.77, Punjab Roadways, Chandigarh to Director State Transport, Punjab, Chandigarh on the subject of appeal against order No. 5900-02 dated 24.03.2011 of Punjab Roadways Chandigarh *vide* Exhibit 'M3'; attested copy of instructions issued by Secretary Transport, Punjab bearing No.17/54 dated 10.02.1997 *vide* Exhibit 'M4'; attested copy of Rule 8.127 of Punjab Civil Services Rules (Vol.I, Part 1) *vide* Exhibit 'M5'; attested copy of medical certificate in respect of Sukhdev Singh S/o Raghbir Singh issued by Senior Resident (Doctor) of Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh recommending leave from 12.10.2010 to 19.10.2010 *vide* Exhibit 'M6'; attested copy of medical certificate in respect of Sukhdev Singh S/o Raghbir Singh issued by Senior Resident (Doctor) of Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh recommending leave from 19.10.2010 to 26.10.2010 *vide* Exhibit 'M7'; attested copy of medical certificate in respect of Sukhdev Singh S/o Raghbir Singh issued by Senior Resident (Doctor) of Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh recommending leave from 09.11.2010 to 09.01.2011 *vide* Exhibit 'M8'; attested copy of order dated 26.02.2018 passed by General Manager, Punjab Roadways, Chandigarh, bearing endorsement No. 8691-8695/ECD dated 22.06.2018 relating to medical leave of Sukhdev Singh - Driver No. 119 *vide* Exhibit 'M9'; attested copy of form of leave account *vide* Exhibit 'M10'. On 29.07.2022 learned Law Officer closed the evidence on behalf of management No.1 & 2.

9. I have heard the arguments of learned representative for the workers' union and learned Law Officer for the management No.1 & 2 and perused the judicial file.

**Issue No1. :—**

10. Onus to prove this issue is on the workers' union.

11. In order to support its case representative for the workers' union referred the testimony of AW1 Jasbir Singh, who *vide* his affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' deposed the material facts of the demand notice-cum-statement of claim. AW1 supported his oral version with documents Exhibit 'W1' and Mark 'A' to 'D'.

12. For corroboration learned representative for the workers' union referred the testimony of AW2 Indu Shekhar, who deposed that she has brought the summoned record of the workman along with medical certificate and leave application for the period from 28.10.2010 to 02.03.2011 consisting of 1 to 55 pages which is correct copy of the record.

13. On the other hand, learned Law Officer for the managements referred testimony of MW1 Surinder Singh, who *vide* his affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' deposed the contents of the written reply in toto and proved his authority letter Exhibit 'M1'. For corroboration learned Law Officer for the managements referred the testimony of MW2 Amit Kumar, who *vide* his affidavit Exhibit 'MW2/A' deposed to the similar effect as deposed by MW1. MW2 supported his oral version with documents Exhibit 'M1' to 'M10'.

14. From the oral as well as documentary evidence led by the parties, it comes out that there is no dispute with regards to the facts that Jasbir Singh is employed as Driver, Driver No. 77 with Punjab Roadways, Chandigarh and while on duty on 28.10.2010, the bus driven by him met with an accident as a result of which

he suffered bodily injuries including fracture of his legs. Jasbir Singh - Driver could not join duty for the period with effect from 28.10.2010 to 28.02.2011 on account of the injuries sustained by him / medical grounds. After obtaining fitness, Jasbir Singh - Driver joined his duties on 01.03.2011.

15. The dispute of parties is confined to the medical leave entitlement of Jasbir Singh - Driver. In this regard, the workers' union have relied upon Mark 'C' i.e. copy of instructions issued by Secretary Transport, Punjab bearing No. 17/54 dated 10.02.1997. The same is also relied upon by the managements and proved into evidence *vide* Exhibit 'M4'. As per Mark 'C'/ Exhibit 'M4' it is instructed by the Transport Department, Government of Punjab that in case anyone from the workshop staff or operational staff of Punjab Roadways get injured during service, then in order to account the period of medical treatment as period of duty the Punjab Civil Services Rules will be applicable. In order to seek the benefit of the aforesaid letter Mark 'C' / Exhibit 'M4' the workers' union alleged that the case of Jasbir Singh - Driver falls under Rule 8.124 and Rule 8.125 of Punjab Civil Services Rules. Under Rule 8.124(6)(ii) leave salary during such leave including a period of such leave granted under condition (4) above shall be equal to full pay for first 120 days. Learned representative for the workers' union further argued that the medical leave does not require medical certificate from any registered medical practitioner. Under Rule 8.13(a) leave application shall be accompanied by a medical certificate given by a registered medical practitioner or a Vaid or Hakim or a Homoeopathic practitioner defining as nearly as possible the nature and probable duration of the illness or by a request for issue of a requisition for examination by a medical officer of the Government. By making reference to the above said provisions of Punjab Civil Services Rules learned representative for the workers' union argued that the medical leave application of Jasbir Singh - Driver has been wrongly considered under Rule 8.127 of Punjab Civil Services Rules whereas Rule 8.124 and 8.125 of Punjab Civil Services Rules is applicable to Jasbir Singh - Driver. Consequently, the order dated 22.03.2011 passed by General Manager, Punjab Roadways, Chandigarh bearing endorsement No. EC3/4900-2 dated 24.03.2011 is illegal. The appeal against the order dated 22.03.2011 rejected *vide* order dated 07.07.2011 is illegal and void being in violation to the provisions of the Punjab Civil Services Rules.

16. On the other hand, learned Law Officer for the management argued that it is Rule 8.127 of Punjab Civil Services Rules, which is applicable to Jasbir Singh - Driver. *Vide* order dated 22.03.2011 the leave on medical ground has been correctly denied to the Jasbir Singh - Driver and consequently the order of appeal dated 07.07.2011 is legal and valid.

17. To my opinion the arguments advanced by learned representative for the workers' union and rule 8.124 and 8.125 if applicable to Jasbir Singh - Driver is devoid of merits. The careful reading of Rule 8.124 and 8.125 of the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume - I, Part - I, clearly show that the said rule are applicable to the employees who have been disabled in consequence of service with the military force. In the present case Jasbir Singh - Driver is not serving in the military but in the Punjab Government. The matter of medical leave of Jasbir Singh - Driver falls within the purview of Rule 8.127 of Punjab Civil Service Rules, Volume - I, Part - I which apart from the maternity leave also deals with hospital leave. Jasbir Singh - Driver has not disputed his leave account. There is no denial to the fact that at the time when Jasbir Singh - Driver applied for the leave he had only 45 days earned leave and 80 days medical leave in his leave account. Accordingly, for the leave period from 29.10.2010 to 01.03.2011, as per Rule 8.127 of the Punjab Civil Services Rules was distributed as below :—

- i) 45 days leave on full pay was sanctioned from 29.10.2010 to 12.12.2010
- ii) 40 days leave was sanctioned against commuted medical leave of 80 days with half pay from 13.12.2010 to 21.01.2011
- iii) For remaining 39 days, as leave account was exhausted, from 22.01.2011 to 21.03.2011 without pay leave was sanctioned.

18. The arguments advanced by learned representative for the worker's union that the matter of medical leave of Sukhdev Singh - Driver No.119 of Punjab Roadways is similar to the matter of Jasbir Singh - Driver No. 77. To support his arguments learned representative for the workers' union referred judgment dated 01.05.2015/ Mark 'D' whereby the Civil Court issued direction to the defendants to reconsider the leave application and claim of plaintiff according to rules and disposed off the same in a period of 60 days. To my opinion the findings of judgment dated 01.05.2015 / Mark 'D' passed by the Court of Additional Civil Judge, (Senior Division), Chandigarh are not binding on this Court. Moreover, as per documents Exhibit 'M6' to 'M8', while applying medical leave to the departments Sukhdev Singh - Driver has filed the medical certificates issued by the registered practitioner of Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh whereas Jasbir Singh - Driver has filed the medical record of Kaushal Hospital, Kharar, District Mohali and medical certificate issued by Kaushal Hospital. None of the medical record / medical certificate of Jasbir Singh is issued by the registered medical practitioner. Therefore, the case of Jasbir Singh - Driver is not similar to the case of Sukhdev Singh - Driver. As per Rule 8.127 (c) Note 3 Hospital leave should be granted on the production by the employee concerned of a medical certificate from a superior officer not below the rank of Gazetted Officer to the effect that illness or injury was directly due to risk incurred in the course of official duties and also that the leave recommended is a necessary to effect a cure. Accordingly, the order dated 22.03.2011 passed by the General Manager, Punjab Roadways, Chandigarh and order of appeal dated 07.07.2011 passed by the Director State Transport, Punjab are legal and valid. Thus, the demand raised in the demand notice-cum-statement of claim is neither genuine nor justified.

19. Accordingly, this issue is decided against the workers' union and in favour of the managements.

**Relief :—**

20. In view of the foregoing discussion on issue above, this reference is declined and answered against the workers' union. Appropriate Government be informed. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . ,

The 29th July, 2022.

(JAGDEEP KAUR VIRK),  
PRESIDING OFFICER,  
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,  
Union Territory, Chandigarh.  
UID No. PB0152.

---

Secretary Labour,  
Chandigarh Administration.

## HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

**Notification**

The 14th September, 2022

**No. 194.**—In exercise of the powers vested in them by Section 139 (b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908; Section 297(1)(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Act No. 2 of 1974) and Section 3(2)(a) of the Oaths Act, 1969 (Act No. 44 of 1969), Hon'ble the Chief Justice and Hon'ble Judges are pleased to appoint :

Sr. No.	Name of the Advocates/ Fathers'/Husband's Name/ Place for which applied for	Remarks
1	Sh. Kuldip Raj, S/o Sh.Bant Raj, District Courts, Chandigarh	For a period of two years w.e.f. 29.09.2022, subject to the curtailment, if any. (For extension)
2	Sh. Avtar Singh, S/o Late Sh. Massa Singh, District Courts, Chandigarh	For a period of two years w.e.f. 29.09.2022, subject to the curtailment, if any. (For extension)
3	Sh. Kishori Lal, S/o Sh. Parshotam Lal, District Courts, Chandigarh	For a period of two years w.e.f. 29.09.2022, subject to the curtailment, if any. (For extension)
4	Sh.Tarsem Lal Kumar, S/o Sh. Babu Ram Kumar, District Courts, Chandigarh	For a period of two years from the date of notification, subject to the curtailment, if any.

as Oath Commissioners for administering oaths and affirmations to the deponents of affidavits under the provisions of the aforesaid Acts in accordance with the terms specified in Rule 5, Chapter 12-B of the High Court Rules and Orders, Volume-IV.

BY ORDER OF HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND HON'BLE JUDGES

(Sd.) . . .,  
Assistant Registrar (Rules),  
*for Registrar General.*

## HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

**Notification**

The 14th September, 2022

**No. 195.**—In exercise of the powers vested in them by Section 139 (b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908; Section 297(1)(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Act No. 2 of 1974) and Section 3(2)(a) of the Oaths Act, 1969 (Act No. 44 of 1969), Hon'ble the Chief Justice and Hon'ble Judges are pleased to appoint:

Sr. No.	Name of the Advocates/ Fathers' Name/ Place for which applied for	Remarks
1	Sh.Subhash Chander, S/o Sh.Bhagwan Dass, High Court Premises	For a period of two years w.e.f. 29.09.2022, subject to the curtailment, if any. (For extension)

as Oath Commissioner for administering oaths and affirmations to the deponents of affidavits under the provisions of the aforesaid Acts in accordance with the terms specified in Rule 5, Chapter 12-B of the High Court Rules and Orders, Volume-IV.

BY ORDER OF HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND HON'BLE JUDGES

(Sd.) . . .,  
Assistant Registrar (Rules),  
*for* Registrar General.

## CHANGE OF NAME

I, Kabir Chopra, S/o Sh. Rajiv Kumar Chopra, R/o H. No. 1707, Sector 34-D, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Kabir Chopra to Karan Chopra.

[719-1]

मैं, Manish Kumar, पुत्र Ranjit Singh, निवासी 1455/24, सैक्टर 29 बी, चंडीगढ़, ने अपना नाम Manish Kumar से बदलकर Paramveer Singh रख लिया है

[720-1]

I, Kamlesh, S/o Moti Lal Kanaujiya, # 87, Sector 11-A, Chandigarh. I have changed my name from Kamlesh to Kamlesh Kumar Kanaujiya.

[721-1]

I, Babita, W/o Sube Singh, # 1195-B, Sector 46-B, Chandigarh, have changed the name of my minor son from Lakshya to Lakshya Rao.

[722-1]

I, Babita, W/o Sube Singh, # 1195-B, Sector 46-B, Chandigarh, have changed the name of my minor daughter from Neelam *Alias* Nilam to Disha Rao.

[723-1]

I, Davendra Singh Chauhan, S/o Abbal Singh, # 571/2, Sector 41-A, Chandigarh, have changed the name of my minor son from Saksham to Saksham Chauhan.

[724-1]

I, Anju Khokhar, W/o Satvir Singh, # 85, Old Indira Colony, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Anju.

[725-1]

I, Jaswinder Singh, S/o Prithvi Singh, # 460, Hallomajra, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Jasvinder Singh.

[726-1]

I, Anil Kumar Roy, S/o Rameshwar Rai, # 182, Phase 1, Ramdarbar Chandigarh, have changed my name to Anil Kumar Rai.

[727-1]

I, Satvir Singh Khokhar, S/o Dharam Pal, R/o # 85, Old Indira Colony, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Satvir Singh.

[728-1]

I, Neha, W/o Sameer, R/o # 1424-C, Small Flats Dhanas, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Sana.

[729-1]

I, Shallu Dhiman, W/o Sanjay Kumar, R/o H. No. 511/A, Village Maloya, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Saroj.

[730-1]

मैं, Jagtar Singh Mundi, पुत्र Puran Singh, निवासी मकान नं 196, बहलाना, चंडीगढ़, ने अपना नाम बदलकर Jagtar Singh रख लिया है

[731-1]

I, Baljit Kaur Mundi, W/o Sh. Jagtar Singh, r/o House No. 196, Village Behlana, Chandigarh, have changed my name as Baljit Kaur.

[732-1]

मैं, Satvir Singh Mundi, पुत्र Jagtar Singh, निवासी मकान नं 196, गांव बहलाना, चंडीगढ़, ने अपना नाम बदलकर Satvir Singh रख लिया है

[733-1]

"No legal responsibility is accepted for the contents of publication of advertisements/public notices in this part of the Chandigarh Administration Gazette. Persons notifying the advertisements/public notices will remain solely responsible for the legal consequences and also for any other misrepresentation etc."